

Appl. No. 10/027,638
Amtd. dated 7/25/05
Reply to Office Action of 3/23/05

PATENT
Docket: 010286

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-5, 18-22, and 28-32 will remain in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-5, 18-22, and 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Haugli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,914,944, hereinafter “Haugli”).

Applicant teaches a technique for generating a local oscillator (LO) signal from signals having two different frequencies, both of which are different from the frequency of the RF input signal, thereby significantly reducing the risk of LO signals re-radiating and coupling the RF signal input (see Abstract).

The Action contends that Haugli discloses generating an LO signal having a frequency determined as a function of the first and second frequencies citing Fig. 4 and col. 7, lines 5-37. However, there is no indication in Fig. 4 or col. 7, lines 5-37 that the frequency of LO 64 is determined as a function of two frequencies. The cited passage merely states that, for that embodiment, the frequency of the LO 64 is determined by frequency controller 65 (col. 7, lines 16-19), with no indication of how the LO frequency is determined.

Consider exemplary claim 1, which recites in relevant part:

“...receiving a first signal having a first frequency and a second signal having a second frequency, the first and second frequencies being different from a frequency of an incoming RF signal;

generating at least one local oscillator signal having a frequency determined as a function of the first and second frequencies...”

Haugli does not describe or suggest generating an LO signal as a function of the frequencies of two signals, both of which have frequencies different from the frequency of the incoming RF signal. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 18, 28, and their dependencies, are allowable.

Appl. No. 10/027,638

Amdt. dated 7/25/05

Reply to Office Action of 3/23/05

PATENT

Docket: 010286

Furthermore, with respect to claim 2, the Action states that "Fig. 11 shows a computer algorithm in estimating the sum and the difference of the first and second frequencies as IF signals are transmitted in unique words or frames, and the error estimates are corrected for the voltage controlled LO reference crystal oscillator" citing col. 12, lines 32-64. Claim 2 requires that, "the frequency of the local oscillator signal is one of a sum and a difference of the first and second frequencies" (emphasis added). Fig. 11 describes an embodiment in which the frequency of the LO signal is selected based on entries in a look-up table (blocks 215 and 216), not generated directly as the sum or difference of the frequencies of two different signals as required by claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 2 and corresponding claims 18 and 29 are allowable for the reasons stated above and for their additional limitations.

Appl. No. 10/027,638
Amdt. dated 7/25/05
Reply to Office Action of 3/23/05

PATENT
Docket: 010286

CONCLUSION


In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/25/05

By:


Kenyon Jenckes, Reg. No. 41,873
858-651-8149

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502